

REMARKS

1  
2 At the outset, the Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Campbell for the  
3 courtesies extended to the undersigned during the telephone interview of 2 October  
4 2005. During this interview, the parties discussed a draft response transmitted by  
5 the Applicant to the Office by e-mail on 29 September 2005. During the telephone  
6 interview on the 2<sup>nd</sup>, the Applicant understood that the Office indicated that the  
7 claim revisions and related remarks contained in the draft response, and carried  
8 forward herein, were likely to overcome the art currently cited in this application.  
9 However, the Office indicated that it would update its search in response to the  
10 claims revisions and remarks herein. The Applicant submits that the foregoing  
11 provides a Statement of the Substance of the Interview sufficient under 37 CFR §  
12 1.133(b).  
13  
14

15  
16 Turning the instant response, the Applicant submits this paper as a fully-  
17 responsive reply to the Official Action mailed by the Office on 25 July 2005  
18 (hereinafter the "Action"). A three-month shortened statutory period for response  
19 was set in the Action. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that this paper is timely  
20 filed on or before 25 October 2005.  
21

22 The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the  
23 rejections stated in the Action.  
24

25 Claims 1-10 and 12-27 are pending in this application.

### §103 Rejections

Paragraph 3 of the Action stated a rejection of **Claims 1-10 and 12-27** under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Neibauer (The ABCs of WordPerfect 8, published in 1997) in view of US Patent No. 6,480,206 to Prinzing (hereinafter, "Prinzing"). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

The Applicant has amended **independent claim 1** as indicated above to clarify further features of the electronic document editor. For convenience, the Applicant reproduces claim 1 as amended above, with redlines included:

"1. (Currently Amended) ~~In an~~ An electronic document editor, ~~a highlight rendering services component comprising:~~

a highlight rendering services component including a highlight rendering services interface that provides one or more methods to enable an editor extension to control which section of an electronic document is highlighted on a screen and to control a style of the highlight, the editor extension determining a visual aspect of the highlight without altering the electronic document and the highlight rendering services component determining non-visual functional aspects of the highlight;

a designer extensibility mechanism;

a plurality of designers, wherein the designers communicate with the electronic document editor through the designer extensibility mechanism and through the highlight rendering services component;

1 a designer registry containing respective entries for the designers, wherein the entries are  
2 arranged in sequential order; and

3 an event routing controller adapted to route events related to the highlight rendering  
4 services component to at least one of the designers based at least in part on the sequential order  
5 of the entries in the designer registry.”

6 These revisions are believed fully supported under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1<sup>st</sup>  
7 paragraph, at least by the Applicant's Figures 2 and 3, and at least by related  
8 description appearing in the Applicant's specification at: page 12, lines 10-22;  
9 page 14, lines 10-14; and page 15, lines 6-11. More particularly, the “designer  
10 extensibility mechanism” as recited in claim 1 is denoted by the reference sign 210  
11 in Figure 2. The “designers” as recited in claim 1 are denoted by the reference  
12 signs 216, 218, and 220 in Figure 2. The “designer registry” as recited in claim 1  
13 is denoted by the reference sign 303 in Figure 3. Finally, the “event routing  
14 controller” as recited in claim 1 is denoted by the reference sign 302 in Figure 3.  
15  
16

17 Turning to the cited art, the Applicants respectfully submit that neither  
18 Neibauer nor Prinzing teach or suggest an electronic document editor having the  
19 features recited above in claim 1. Neibauer is an excerpt from a user manual for  
20 the WORDPERFECT® word processor, but neither teaches nor suggests  
21 extensions to a document editor.  
22  
23

24 Turning to the secondary reference, Prinzing, the Applicants agree that  
25 Neibauer does not disclose a method in which the non-visual and visual aspects of

1 the highlight are determined by separate extensions, as stated in Paragraph 4 of the  
2 Final Action. Thus, the Office cited Prinzing as a secondary reference, more  
3 particularly, column 2, line 55 through column 4, line 14 of Prinzing. While  
4 Prinzing may refer to various aspects of a method and apparatus for an extensible  
5 editor, the Applicant respectfully submits that Prinzing neither teaches nor  
6 suggests at least the following features recited in claim 1:

7  
8 "a plurality of designers, wherein the designers communicate with the electronic  
9 document editor through the designer extensibility mechanism and through the highlight  
10 rendering services component;

11  
12 a designer registry containing respective entries for the designers, wherein the entries are  
13 arranged in sequential order; and

14 an event routing controller adapted to route events related to the highlight rendering  
15 services component to at least one of the designers based at least in part on the sequential order  
16 of the entries in the designer registry".

17  
18 Prinzing's Figures 3 and 4, for example, illustrate paragraph style objects  
19 and paragraph view objects, respectively. Prinzing also references a hierarchy for  
20 organizing text in, for example, column 2, lines 44-54. However, the Applicant  
21 submits that Prinzing neither teaches nor suggests at least the foregoing features  
22 that are recited in the Applicant's claim 1.

23  
24 Based at least on the foregoing, the Applicant submits that Neibauer and  
25 Prinzing, whether considered severally or in combination, do not support a § 103

1 rejection of claim 1 because they do not teach or suggest at least the above features  
2 recited in claim 1. The Applicant thus requests reconsideration and withdrawal of  
3 the § 103 rejection of claim 1. These comments apply equally to claims 2-9, which  
4 depend from claim 1 and stand rejected on similar grounds.

5  
6 **Independent claims 10, 17, and 22** are amended to clarify further aspects  
7 of the computer readable medium, the method, and the electronic document editor,  
8 respectively. More particularly, claims 10, 17, and 22 are amended to recite  
9 features similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1 above. Thus,  
10 the above comments directed to claim 1 regarding 112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, support  
11 apply equally to claims 10, 17, and 22. Additionally, the above comments  
12 regarding the cited art of Neibauer and Prinzing apply equally to claims 10, 17, and  
13 22.  
14

15  
16 Dependent claims 12-16 depend from independent claim 10, and stand  
17 rejected on similar grounds. Dependent claims 18-21 depend from independent  
18 claim 17 and stand rejected on similar grounds. Dependent claims 23-27 depend  
19 from independent claim 22 and stand rejected on similar grounds. Accordingly,  
20 the foregoing comments apply equally to these dependent claims 12-16, 18-21, and  
21 23-27.  
22

23 **Conclusion**  
24  
25

1 The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the  
2 § 103 rejections of Claims 1-10 and 12-27 as stated in the Action. If personal  
3 discussion would advance prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to  
4 contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

6 Respectfully Submitted,

8 Date: 20 OCT 05

9 By: 

Rocco L. Adornato  
Reg. No. 40,480  
(509) 324-9256; x257